DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 462 SP 025 563

AUTHOR King, Ruth
TITLE Issues Related to Faculty Welfare and Faculty Value Orientations.
PUB DATE 8 Nov 84
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Studies Association (San Francisco, CA, November 8-11, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; *Educational Philosophy; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; Humanism; *Management by Objectives; Professional Recognition; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Educators; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Salaries; *Teacher Welfare

ABSTRACT

The philosophical split between behaviorists and humanists has caused tension among education faculty on many campuses. Foundations faculty often identify themselves with a "humanist" perspective, while administrators, increasingly pressured by state mandates and public calls for accountability, adhere to behaviorist management principles and practices. Thus, humanist faculty frequently find themselves with the problem of maintaining the integrity of their value system and their personal welfare, particularly in times of reduced resources. A review is presented of faculty appraisal systems and management styles of teacher education departments, and an analysis shows how these systems and styles affect the productivity, status, and morale of education faculty, especially foundations faculty. Examined are issues which relate to accountability, reward systems, faculty morale, and philosophical orientation in one teacher education department. Results of a career orientation inventory, which identified the career attitudes, needs, and values of 17 faculty members, are presented. An analysis of the results of the inventory, when examined in the context of salary and career advancement, indicated that foundations faculty suffer materially because of their philosophic base in the humanistic approach to education. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ruth King

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED251462

ISSUES RELATED TO FACULTY WELFARE AND FACULTY VALUE ORIENTATIONS

RUTH KING

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION

San Francisco, CA

November 8, 1984

SP 025 563

ISSUES RELATED TO FACULTY WELFARE AND FACULTY VALUE ORIENTATIONS

Introduction

For the past two decades, the philosophical split between behaviorists and humanists has caused tension among education faculty on many campuses. Foundations faculty often identify themselves with a "humanist" perspective whereas administrators have been increasingly pressured by state mandates and public calls for accountability to adhere to behaviorist management principles and practices. Humanist faculty are then caught in a bind between maintaining the integrity of their value system and their personal welfare, particularly in times of reduced resources.

How has this situation affected the productivity, status, and morale of education faculty and especially foundations faculty? This study examines some data and issues related to accountability, reward systems, faculty morale and philosophical orientations in one teacher education department.

All information used for this study was in the public domain. As a tax-supported institution, all salaries are published and are available in the library. Information on rank and length of service is published yearly in an annual report; age and sex were self-reported.

Theoretical Discussion

The terms "humanist" and "behaviorist" serve to describe what were, or are, two major camps in the field of educational psychology. The behaviorist position, rooted in the early 20th century theories of Pavlov, Watson, and Thorndike, is today most eloquently stated by B. F. Skinner. The humanists, who emanate from Gestalt/Cognitive-Field theories, have had Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, and Arthur Combs as their spokesmen.

Behaviorists share a set of beliefs about the nature of reality that is most closely aligned to the philosophical position of the positive realists or logical empiricists.[1] That is, that the physical world as experienced by human beings is real and essentially what it appears to be when observed through the senses. Existence is independent of a thing's being known. The physical world is governed by natural laws that operate in a mechanistic way. The basic principle being cause and effect, that every event is determined by what went before it.

For the behaviorist, environment is all. Man is a passive creature in a determining environment. If a thing exists, they argue, then it exists in some amount and that amount can be measured. Only overt, observable behavior is therefore studied (e.g., bodily movement, pulse rate, etc.).

In schools, behaviorists would tend to believe that subject matter ought to be selected by qualified adults prior to the teaching act, that it should reflect the skills and facts useful to contemporary society and should be inculcated in students through reinforcement (Bigge, 1976).

---

[1] Not all scholars would agree with this placement. O'Neill (1981) claims the philosophical parentage of behaviorists to be the experimentalists.

Behaviorists tend to focus more on means rather than ends. O'Neill (1981) calls strict, "hard" behaviorists the "method liberals" or "technocratc experimentalists."

> Many consider themselves as essentially specialists or technicians who operate in a relatively "value-free" realm of curriculum and methodological problem-solving. As such, they do not view themselves as implicated in the philosophical arena at all. They would deny that their behavior is appropriately described as "ideological" in any meaningful sense. (p. 265)

The concern for methods and for control of the environment have led them to advocate a competency based curriculum, the use of behavioral objectives, and schedules of reinforcement for the modification of behavior.

In the 1970's, the most recent heyday of the behaviorists, competency-based programs were mandated in many states.

Education faculty who consider themselves behaviorists tend to be specialists. They seem to be found teaching learning theory, classroom management; teaching skills or methods courses. They tend to give multiple choice tests that can be machine scored. They are attracted to logical systems (preferably those that have 8 steps, taxonomies, behavioral objectives or assertive discipline). They design courses of study that break knowledge down into "digestible bits" that are then distributed sequentially throughout the program at intervals called "introduction", "reinforcement," and "mastery." They assume that when something is "covered" (or taught or "told"), then it is learned. They believe that students should be told at the start of a course, what it is they will learn. This is always stated in behavioral terms and includes a precise description of the grading system and the number of "points" that each assignment is "worth" in calculating the final grade.

Foundations faculty, on the other hand, identify more closely with the humanist perspective. They see themselves as generalists rather than specialists. Those I know are less concerned about facts than they are in the relationships between facts. Their interest is in the "big picture" or the broad view. Their tests are more often of the essay type, requiring students to synthesize ideas, apply concepts to new problems, to make judgments or relate content to their own personal lives.

Humanists have a hard time remembering what the 8 steps are but they like to draw diagrams. Humanist faculty are not as concerned about sequence since they do not see themselves as being involved in skill training. They like to involve students in argument and debate. They welcome the unexpected. Writing a syllabus that "lays it all out" frustrates them because it does not allow for dealing with student interests or concerns or for letting the dialogue lead in new directions. These faculty are more interested in raising questions than in prescribing outcomes.

These preferences, or personality constructs, or philosophical orientations of humanists derive from phenomenology, an existential philosophy based on the theory of relativity. Reality is seen in a constant state of flux. What we perceive is only a close approximation of what was. The way we perceive any object

is colored by the total situation or gestalt. Since each person's perceptual environment is unique, no two people experience events in exactly the same way. The meaning of any given event lies not in the event but in our interpretation of that event (Bigge, 1976).

Given that these differences occur in faculties in departments, schools, and colleges of education, what "goodness of fit" is there between these views and faculty appraisal systems?

Faculty appraisal

Faculty appraisal systems tend to be behaviorial, that is, they start with the belief that faculty are passive and need to be motivated to increased performance levels by reinforcement schedules. Like the syllabus for students, faculty appraisal systems spell out for faculty exactly what they must do in order to get the points that are translated into dollars. In our college, it is now possible to get 200 points for the maximum meritorious salary raise. Minimum expectations in the area of teaching, scholarship and service are set and meeting them results in 100 points. Minimal expectations in scholarship are set at three activities of which one must be traditional scholarship (an article or chapter in a book, etc.). Service also requires a minimum of three activities (i.e., committee membership, local presentations, consultantships, etc). Teaching minimums include attendance at at least one professional development activity or conference, updated syllabi on file, evidence of student feedback, kept office hours, etc. Actually, teaching was considered too difficult to evaluate and so unless student feedback is terrible or you forget to go to a conference, all faculty are automatically given merit (double points) in this area.

The faculty appraisal system in our college has been evolving and has rarely remained stable for more than a few years. In the beginning, faculty were evaluated by the Dean and associate dean(s) in an informal manner. Then, in order to become more "objective", faculty were required to submit a "faculty self-report" that listed their accomplishments in the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Then the system was modified to include a "management by objectives" component. Now faculty meet with the director in January to set objectives for the year. At the end of the year, they submit their self-reports to document their achievements. This caused difficulties for some faculty (particularly foundation faculty) who found that the objectives they set for themselves in January were not the projects that interested them in May or September. Other faculty found that the system relieved anxiety about evaluation because they never included in their objectives anything they hadn't already completed. Gamesmanship abounded.

An ad hoc faculty committee recommended a point system for faculty evaluation spelling out the "value" of every activity. This system was rejected as too mechanistic by the faculty, but a modified point system remained. At first it was a 100 point system; twenty five points allotted for each area (teaching, scholarship and service), an additional 25 points to be assigned to an area of emphasis. Most faculty assigned this to teaching.

The next step in the evolution of our faculty appraisal system was the introduction of merit. If one was outstanding in any one area, you could get an additional 25 points for a total of 125 points. But then the administrators were concerned because some few faculty were exceeding expectations in more than one area or even in all three areas. To reward them and to clarify expectations, it would now be possible to attain 200 points. To get 200 points, you would need to document meritorious achievement in four areas: teaching (merit automatic unless by exception), scholarship and service efforts would have to be doubled in order to achieve merit or double points.

In addition, the faculty emphasis was now called "faculty choice" and additional effort corresponding to the level required in other areas was now expected. So if the faculty choice area was scholarship, you would now have to write three additional articles (or a total of nine). Finally, to receive merit in the area of choice would require a negotiated project of considerable effort.

The productivity required had been effectively tripled and faculty were upset. No one was required to seek merit and several faculty who see themselves as philosophically opposed to the concept of merit have opted out of the pool. Some of these are foundations faculty, some are not. Most faculty aspire to the full 200 points. Each point corresponds to a dollar amount depending on rank (e.g., for a full professor the value of each point may be $9; for an associate professor, $7, and for an assistant professor, $5). A full professor who meets expectations can earn almost the equivalent to an assistant professor who earns merit in all areas.

As a result of what faculty saw as increasingly impossible demands, they protested. However, when this did not lead to change, they accommodated themselves to the new reality. Faculty morale declined. There were never many faculty around on Fridays; now Thursdays seemed likewise deserted. Faculty spent a great deal of time checking their retirement plans (even those in their forties) and counted the years until they "had their thirty in." Others have found their fulfillment outside the university setting, either in professional organizations or private practice, or in garages, hobby shops, flea markets or golf courses.

Although quality of production was never considered in evaluating production, the faculty became very frank about writing their three articles on November 30th, the day before the self-reports were due. The accountability system was no longer operating to meet organizational needs either.

Management Styles

The behavioral approach to faculty appraisal is very similar to "management by objectives" in the business world. The aping of business by educators has a long history. It goes back at least to 1910 when at a meeting of the National Society of College Teachers of Education, Spalding advocated more efficiency in school administration. This marked the beginning of the application of business principles to education (Callahan, 1962). Since then, the "cult of efficiency" has been entrenched in educational administration.

A very different approach to management of both business and colleges was advocated by McGregor (1960) who based his theory X and theory Y on behaviorist and humanist perspectives.

He described the assumptions on which the theory X accountability system operated; they are the assumptions on which the faculty appraisal system was also based:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.

2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.

3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all.

Theory Y, on the other hand, has a very different set of assumptions.

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

2. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. (ego and self-actualization)

4. The human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

5. Capacity to problem solve and creativity is widely distributed.

6. Under conditions of modern industrial life, human intellectual potentialities only partially used.

Theory Y advocates a management system that creates the conditions for self-respect (meeting egoistic needs) and gaining the respect of one's fellows (meeting social needs). If these are not met, then the consequences are indolence, unwillingness to accept responsibility, and resistance to change. (McGregor, 1960). These are the very results experienced by the College in question.

With the popularity of the Peters and Waterman book, In Search of Excellence, comes a renewed interest in new management styles and in our institution, plans are underway to incorporate some of these ideas into our evolving faculty appraisal system now called faculty development and appraisal system.

The Study

The career orientation inventory (DeLong, 1981) was given to seventeen faculty members in Spring/Fall of 1984.[1] The inventory identifies different career attitudes, needs and values along nine dimensions: (1) technical/functional competence, (2) managerial competence, (3) autonomy, (4) job security, (5) geographic security, (6) service, (7) identity, (8) variety, and (9) creativity.

The inventory is based on the "career anchor" model (Shein, 1978) which suggests that certain motivational/talent/value drives are formed through work experiences and that these can guide and constrain entire careers. Only particularly high or low scores along the nine dimensions were plotted to give a profile for each individual.

(1) Technical/Functional Competence[2]

This describes people who are motivated by the challenge of the actual work they do, e.g., their specific educational expertise. Their anchor is the technical field, functional area, or content of their work. The self image of those who score high in this area is tied to feelings of competence in their field.

(2) Managerial Competence

Those who score high in this area are individuals who perceive their competence to lie in the ability to analyze problems, remain emotionally stable, and interpersonally competent. The person with a high score values the process of managing.

(3) Autonomy

The "autonomy" orientation encompasses those who have found organizational life to be restrictive, irrational, and/or intrusive into their lives. They are primarily concerned about their own sense of freedom and autonomy. They seek a work environment maximally free of constraints.

(4) Security I

Individuals with security as their orientation have tied their careers to a particular organization. The "security" oriented individual would focus on organizations that provide long-term stability, good benefits, and basic job security.

(5) Security II

This orientation relates to the interest in a specific geographical location. Individuals who are security oriented typically would not move from a certain geographic location unless the organizational rewards would merit a move.

(6) Service

Individuals who are "service" oriented are concerned with seeing people change because of their efforts. They want to use their interpersonal and helping skills in the service of others or in support of an important cause.

---

[1]The faculty were all in the Division of Teacher Education, teaching both graduate masters level and undergraduate courses.

[2]All these descriptions come from DeLong's "Information Sheet" to accompany the "Career Orientation Inventory."

(7) Identity

Individuals who are guided throughout their careers by the status and prestige of belonging to certain organizations are "identity" oriented. They value working for organizations which have high visibility and a particular reputation either locally or nationally.

(8) Variety

Individuals who desire an endless number of different jobs or challenges are "variety" oriented. They want careers which provide a maximum variety of assignments and work projects.

(9) Creativity

"Creativity" oriented individuals have a need to create something on their own. Individuals with a creativity orientation keep getting into new ventures and trying their hand in new kinds of projects.

Figure I plots the results of this inventory along with other variables. "X" indicates a high score on this dimension; "O" indicates a particularly low score on this dimension.

(See Figure I)

Sex As a Variable

There were seven women and ten men in this survey. Six out of seven women and half the men scored high in Technical/Functional Competence. Just over half the men and just under half of the women scored high on variety and autonomy. All but one man scored high on service and this is clearly a shared group value. Eighty percent of the men scored high on creativity but only 57% of the women. None of these seem to be significant differences.

Age as a Variable

Eight faculty classified themselves as age fifty plus and eight were between forty and fifty years of age. Only one faculty member included in the study was in his thirties.

Those who were in their forties scored highest in service, technical/functional, variety and creativity. Those in their fifties scored highest in service, security I, creativity, and autonomy.

FIGURE 1

	(1) T/F	(2) MGR	(3) AUT	(4) SEC I	(5) SEC II	(6) SER	(7) ID	(8) VAR	(9) CRE	SEX	AGE	YRS SERV	RANK	SALARY	DIFFERENTIAL
1.			X		X		O		X	M	50+	18	F	38	--
2.	X	X			O	X	X	X	X	M	40+	17	F	46	+9
3.	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	F	40+	15	F	43	+8
4.	X				O	X	O	X	X	M	40+	9	F	33	+4
5.	X			X		X	X	X	X	M	40+	14	F	38	+4
6.	X		X			X	O	X		M	40+	12	F	36	+4
7.	X	X		X	X	X	X			F	50+	9	F	35	+6
8.	X		X	X		X	O		X	F	50+	13	Assoc.	31	--
9.*		X	X		X	X	X		X	M	50+	20	Assoc.	34	-4
10.	X		X		O	X	O	X		F	40+	7	Assoc.	28	+3
11.	X					X	O	X		M	30+	6	Assoc.	30	+6
12.	X	X			O	X	X		X	F	50+	10	Assoc.	34	+6
13.	X	O	X	X	X	X	O			F	50+	11	Assoc.	34	+5
14.*			X	X		X			X	M	40+	10	Assoc.	26	-2
15.*	O	O	X	X		X		X	X	M	50+	16	Assoc.	34	--
16.*				X		X		X	X	F	50+	16	Asst.	30	-3
17.*			X	X	X	X			X	M	40+	14	Asst.	27	-4

* Foundations Faculty

Years of Service, rank & Salary

It was hypothesized that rank and salary should be roughly correlated with years of service at the university. A model (artificial) salary scale taking these factors into account was developed by choosing the full professor who had been at the university longest and whose career seemed to follow the normal pattern (i.e., he was never an administrator, and was promoted through the ranks as outlined in the faculty handbook), and using his present salary as the point of reference on the scale. For each additional year of service, $1000 was added; $1000 per year was subtracted as one moved down the scale in years of service. An associate professor who is promoted to full professor is given an automatic $2000 increase; an assistant professor is given an additional $1000 when he moves to the associate rank, and so these figures were subtracted from the scale.

FIGURE II

Years	Full	Assoc.	Assist.
20	40,000	38	37
19	39,000	37	36
18	38,000	36	35
17	37,000	35	34
16	36,000	34	33
15	35,000	33	32
14	34,000	32	31
13	33,000	31	30
12	32,000	30	29
11	31,000	29	28
10	30,000	28	27
9	29,000	27	26
8	28,000	26	25
7	27,000	25	24
6	26,000	24	23

So, a full professor who had been at the university for 12 years would be expected to be making $32,000; an associate $30,000 and an assistant $29,000.

On the basis of this scale, the differential for each faculty member was plotted. The differential was stated in thousands (e.g., a person who was getting a salary $3000 above where they should be according to the scale was given a +3; if they were just where their rank and experience would place them, they were represented by a dash; $2000 less than expected would be listed as -2). the range was from +9 through -4.

Results

When these factors were correlated with the career orientation factors, an interesting pattern emerged. Every person who scored high on technical/functional competence was on or above the salary scale. Eleven faculty followed this pattern with one person being at scale and ten above. All those who did not rate technical/functional competence as a high value (or rated it as a low value) fell below the salary scale or on scale. Six faculty were in this category, four of whom were below scale and two at scale. All five foundations faculty were in this latter category.

REFERENCES

Bigge, Morris L. Learning Theories for Teachers (Third Edition) New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1976.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

DeLong, Thomas J. "Career Anchors: A New Concept in Career Development for the Professional Educator." Unpublished. (Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602).

DeLong, Thomas. Career Orientation Inventory. Thomas J. DeLong & Associates, 1981.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

O'Neill, William F. Educational Ideologies. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1981.

Peters, Thomas J. and Robert H. Waterman. In Search of Excellence. New York: Warner Books, 1982.